JOURNAL
OF
CALENDAR REFORM

EDITORS
CHARLES D. MORRIS CARL LIDDLE

Published by
THE WORLD CALENDAR ASSOCIATION
485 Madison Avenue, New York City
ELISABETH ACHELIS, *President*

VOL. I DECEMBER, 1931 No. 4

WORLD VIEWPOINTS

An Address at the League of Nations by Elisabeth Achelis, President of The World Calendar Association

Under the presidency of Dr. A. de Vasconcellos of Portugal, the Fourth General Conference on Communications and Transit of the League of Nations assembled for its quadrennial meeting at Geneva on October 12. Delegates from forty-one nations were in attendance, together with a considerable number of unofficial observers from interested organizations and groups throughout the world. The principal order of business before the Conference was the discussion of Calendar Reform, which occupied the first eight days of its two weeks' sittings. At the opening session, the argument on behalf of the perpetual 12-month revision of the Calendar was presented by the President of The World Calendar Association.

THE OPENING day of this conference, October 12, marked the 439th anniversary of the discovery of America, whereby two distinct and mutually strange worlds became known to one another. On the same date, approximately four and a half centuries later, citizens of both the old and new worlds have assembled here before the League of Nations to discuss a common interest—calendar reform.

In this modern age the economic world leans more and more upon experience; experience depends more intensively upon statistical records; and statistics demands a better arrangement of time-units by which comparisons can be made between one period and another. Socially, too, there is need for greater ease and accuracy in time schedules.

It is for the purpose of exchanging views as to the best way of removing the admitted deficiencies of the Gregorian Calendar and of obtaining

the essential requirements of a reformed calendar—comparability, stability and regularity—that we have come together here at Geneva in its historic atmosphere of friendship, goodwill and co-operation.

I have frequently been asked what aroused my interest in this reform, and why The World Calendar Association was organized when there was already functioning in the United States a National Committee which had received recognition from the League of Nations.

A little more than two years ago I attended a lecture on calendar simplification, which was my first introduction to the subject. The lecturer was an ardent advocate of the thirteen month plan. His arguments, however, were to me disturbing and his reform-proposal drastic and confusing.

His disquieting address was still fresh in my mind when a few days later I read a letter in the New York *Times* wherein a correspondent opposed the 13-month plan and called attention to an alternative one, known to Europe, whereby the 12-month arrangement was retained, the quarters equalized and the calendar made perpetual by the use of Year Day and Leap Day. To me the practicability of this plan was obvious, and as soon as I had leisure I began to study the subject.

As my studies progressed I became conscious of four outstanding facts:

First, that the 13-month plan was unnecessarily extreme in its methods of correcting the faults of the present calendar.

Second, that the United States Committee on Calendar Simplification was unduly biased in its advocacy of the 13-month plan.

Third, that owing to this bias a poor presentation of a 12-month equal-quarter revision had been given to the American public.

Fourth, that persistent stressing of the advantages of the 13-month plan was creating a distorted picture in the minds of the American people.

From these facts I reached the conclusion that there was urgent need for a fair presentation in America of the 12-month equal-quarter year and that this would necessitate a movement organized independently of the existing Committee.

It was with reluctance that I reached this conclusion, for I believe in co-operation whenever possible. In this instance it might have seemed especially desirable, for Mr. Eastman and his associates had unselfishly done a great work in calling attention to the defects of the calendar. In their remedy, however, I felt that they had gone too far and that their plan could not possibly win world-acceptance. Their solution was one which would complicate rather than simplify.

The organization of The World Calendar Association, therefore, became a necessity, and it has been justified, I think, by the popular response which it has received. During the past six months its membership has reached a total of nearly 5,000 persons, representing every field of Amer-

ican life and activity. There are sections of members from education, transportation, communication, agriculture, business administration, banking, the law, medicine, the clergy, the press, public libraries, public service and so on.

The result of our entry into the reform movement has undoubtedly stimulated interest throughout the United States. Up to a year ago the so-called National Committee was almost the only voice which had been raised in our country, and it was natural, therefore, that most people thought of calendar reform and the 13-month plan as synonymous. I became convinced that a great majority of the public found the 13-month plan too drastic for their taste and therefore silently rejected all reform as impractical and unnecessary.

II.

In our discussion here this week, we have the benefit of several years of pioneer work on behalf of calendar reform, which has enabled the League of Nations to reach certain definite conclusions. Your committee has eliminated many plans because they introduced new difficulties fully as serious as those which you are attempting to remedy. You have also removed from consideration the correction of certain admitted imperfections in the calendar as impossible of public acceptance; for example, changing the beginning of the year to the winter solstice.

The League has decided that any decision on religious questions is outside the scope of this conference and must be referred to authorities adequately representing the religious groups of the world.

The League's emphasis on a perpetual calendar has, of course, met with some objections. The World Calendar Association, however, recognizes and cannot stress too strongly the fact that the indispensable quality of any new calendar must be stability. Without the adoption of a perpetual calendar the year would still shift as heretofore, and certainly halfway measures of reform would not satisfy a public when it is informed sufficiently to accept the idea of change.

In order to secure a perpetual calendar which does no violence to astronomical law and at the same time continues the seven-day week, two supplementary days, Year Day and Leap Day, must be introduced. With their introduction, every year will coincide with the preceding and following ones. Thus comparability, stability and regularity are secured and all daily, weekly, monthly, yearly and centennial reckonings are simplified. The benefits of such an arrangement will be felt in every department of human endeavor throughout the world.

There also have been discussions in regard to the League's recommendations for stabilizing holidays. It appears to be the general opinion that national holidays should be left to each nation for adjustment. Complete uniformity among all nations in respect to holidays may not be possible,

but if they were generally permitted to fall on Mondays it would greatly facilitate many fields of activity.

On one aspect of calendar reform there seems to be general agreement. The inconvenience of the present wandering Easter is recognized on all sides. I would like, however, to suggest that we who advocate calendar reform cannot be satisfied with the vague proposal to stabilize Easter without waiting for a perpetual calendar, as such an Easter would still wander within a cycle of seven days. To secure a partial instalment of Calendar Reform of this kind would appear to me to be in the highest degree unfortunate, as it must inevitably prejudice the chances of removing the defects of the Calendar, now regarded as indisputable by all who have studied the subject. There can be no halfway house in this matter. The whole question, of which the date of Easter is only a part, must be settled once and for all at the same time. It is 180 years since the Calendar was last reformed and it is not likely that we shall see two instalments of reform within our lifetime. I would, therefore, adjure the Conference, if it accepts the principle of Calendar Reform, to regard the fixation of Easter as an integral part of the reform and not as a separate question outside it and preliminary to it.

As to the date upon which a fixed Easter should fall, I am of opinion that this should be the subject of further discussion. There are arguments against April 15th, the date most generally favored, which it would be out of place to discuss here but to which I refer in a separate memorandum submitted to the Conference.*

III.

I come now to the plan for a perpetual calendar. The principal faults which we are seeking to remedy are: First, the present inequality of the length of months and quarters; and Second, the failure of the days of the week and month to coincide in successive years.

May I call attention to the fact that the number of months in the Gregorian Calendar has nothing whatever to do with its present irregularities for which a remedy is sought? In fact, the number 12 has so much to recommend it, including convenient divisibility, that any suggestion for change seems unwarranted and ill-considered.

The equal-quarter revision, known in the United States as The World Calendar, starts with the solid foundation of retaining every desirable

*Memorandum: In a perpetual calendar April 15th has been frequently mentioned as the date for the observance of Easter. But the report of the Preparatory Committee stresses the point that the 15th is an important date for the payment of rents. It is equally important as regards dividends, interest and taxes. And the disadvantage of Easter coming on such a business date is increased by the fact that the Easter holiday in many countries spreads over a period of three or even four days and would thus interfere seriously with business appointments and engagements. Furthermore, this date would introduce an alien note into the religious spirit of the holiday. The World Calendar Association has, therefore, recommended either April 8, which is nearest to the historical date, or April 22, which might prove more acceptable to many countries because of climatic conditions. With the latter date for Easter Day, Whitsunday would fall on June 10th.

feature of the present calendar, particularly and especially the division of the year into 12 months.

By giving these months a regular quota of days, and evenly apportioning the quarters of the year, all the required improvement and stability of the calendar is obtained with few changes, no inconveniences, no upheavals, no statistical confusions and no increased expenditures. A satisfactory uniformity is attained without losing a pleasing quality of variety.

The distinctive characteristic of this plan is its conformity with the four established units of time-measurement, the day, the week, the month, and the season or quarter. Four times during the year, at the end of each quarter, these units synchronize—the 91 days, the 13 weeks, the three months, and the seasons or quarter-divisions. This scientific and mathematical balance and order is vitally important.

As an illustration of its value, let us take a corporation composed of several departments, which function quite separately from one another, yet belong to and derive their existence from the parent company. There is, for instance, one department which deals with temporary workers whose wages are computed on a daily basis. There is another department in charge of permanent employees with financial operations based on the week as a unit. The shipping and transportation sections use the month for their records; while the major financing of the corporation, including dividends, bond interest and general reports, is computed on a quarterly basis. Relations with consumers fluctuate seasonally and therefore are figured in quarterly periods.

Every quarter—the perfect unit—directors of this corporation meet to study the reports from the different departments. Plans for the future are made accordingly, and financial statements are sent to shareholders based on the results of comparisons with previous periods.

In this corporation, then, we find several calendar units in use in the various departments, each according to its needs emphasizing the day, the week, the month, the season or the quarter. But it is essential that these units shall synchronize. Otherwise the work is unduly complicated and a broad survey of the whole business is unobtainable.

Only under an equal-quarter calendar is such synchronization conveniently possible. The 13-month plan, by discarding quarterly units, would bring confusion into corporation accounting. But under the proposed 12-month division, all time-units would coincide with a perfection which has never been possible under the present calendar.

I have in mind another illustration, more homely and more intimate in its application. Let us suppose a family with four children. The youngest returns to the paternal home each evening after work; the next comes from a nearby city only at the end of the week. Another pays his visit to the family monthly; and the fourth returns at the end of each season.

You will note that only under the equal-quarter calendar can the entire family circle be united at one time. And this happy event occurs four times every year.

These two illustrations indicate the perfect adaptability of the revised 12-month calendar to business and domestic life. Scientifically, it is not possible for us to disregard the seasons. Seasonal phenomena fill the world around us. They rule all our occupations. The quarterly period of seasonal succession imposes itself upon us as a unit of time with an authority no less absolute than the period of day or year, astronomically fixed and immutable.

The World Calendar Association since its organization less than a year ago, has worked along lines laid down by the League of Nations, and has consistently used the League's terminology in defining its position and program, so that the plan which it is advocating would reconcile itself easily with those advocated by various Committees of other countries.

Even countries where no official committees exist have begun to show a keen interest in calendar reform. Japan is represented at the present conference, although it has no formal organization dealing with the subject. The news we have received from Japan indicates that the 13-month proposals are not popular there, and a communication which has just some to me from the Tokio office of the League of Nations indicates that there is more likelihood of the Japanese people supporting a 12-month plan.

The Journal of Calendar Reform, which we instituted as a forum for discussion, is mailed regularly to the various calendar committees of the different countries, and to other interested organizations and individuals throughout the world.

IV.

What then is the next step to be taken? Probably we shall agree that the world is not yet ready for reform. A vast amount of educational work is necessary before so decisive a step can expect to receive popular acceptance and approval.

But I think this Conference could go far to clarify the situation by making a definite pronouncement in support of a perpetual calendar. The point I would impress upon the Conference is this: that it is only by means of a perpetual calendar that we can obtain the desired qualities of comparability, stability and regularity.

With such a decision behind us, we shall be able to go forward on a firm foundation of accomplishment.

The 12-month calendar has the approval of so many centuries of usage that its origin is earlier than history. It has its foundation in our oldest and most sacred traditions. The concluding chapter of the Christian Bible makes it an essential part of the allegory of the tree of life, and the Koran states that "twelve months is the number of months with God."

BRITISH OPINION

Address at the League of Nations by C. David Stelling, Honorary Secretary of the British Parliamentary Committee on Calendar Reform.

Despite England's preoccupation with local politics on the eve of an important national election, the British Parliamentary Committee sent its honorary secretary to Geneva to present forcibly and emphatically the British support of a 12-month revision and opposition to any 13-month proposal. The chairman of the Parliamentary Committee, Sir Philip Richardson, M.P., was unable to be present, owing to his absence in South Africa. Before leaving England, however, he affixed his signature to the Report of the Committee, which was presented to the League of Nations by the secretary and is appended to Mr. Stelling's address below.

I SPEAK for the British Parliamentary Committee on Calendar Reform. You will have received the Report of the Chairman of my Committee, and it is not necessary for me to repeat what it contains, but I may perhaps be permitted to draw attention to one or two salient points.

I am here not to plead but to interpret. It was the object of my Committee to secure if possible a positive expression of public opinion in Great Britain to supplement the report which the representative of the Burnham Committee of Inquiry described to your Preparatory Committee in June as "negative and inconclusive."

The Report which I have submitted expresses not the views of a Committee but the results of a referendum taken among typical sections of the British people. I wish to emphasize that my Committee does not claim that the opinions are representative, but only that they are typical. Thus the Lord Mayors and Mayors of some 80 cities and towns have answered the questions put to them. We do not say that the Lord Mayor of Liverpool represents 1,000,000 Englishmen, but we believe that the opinions of 80 mayors may be regarded as typical of what we call the man-in-the-street, especially when every other test applied produces similar results. Thus we took at random 1000 names from a list of 30,000 to 40,000 members of the British League of Nations Union. Their replies to our questions pointed emphatically in the same direction.

The general deductions to which we are irresistibly led are these:

First, that British public opinion is overwhelmingly in favor of stabilizing the date of Easter.

Second, that when attention is drawn to the defects of the Gregorian Calendar, reform is regarded as desirable by four persons out of five.

Third, that a 13-month year is definitely repugnant to British feeling and that, unless it were shown that such a system would be immeasurably

superior to any 12-month system, it would be impossible to pass the legislation necessary to bring it into effect.

Fourth, that a time of grave economic and political crisis like the present is unfavorable for the discussion of Calendar Reform, but under more normal conditions British public opinion would welcome a reformed 12-Month Perpetual Calendar.

These conclusions are derived not only from the results of the referendum but also from inquiries made among Members of Parliament and other public men, and from the attitude of the Press. The outstanding impression is that despite the very zealous and able educative campaign conducted in Great Britain over a long period by the International Fixed Calendar League and its offspring organizations, the 13-month year has not only gained *no* support for itself in the national press, but has tended to make unpopular Calendar Reform of any kind. Recent evidence of this may be found in articles that have appeared in the London *Daily Mail* and the London *Evening Standard.* It is unfortunate, too, that the close association of the 13-month scheme with the League of Nations offers adverse journalistic critics yet another opportunity to cast ridicule upon the League.

In view of the fact that this Conference is paying some attention to the religious objections to Calendar Reform, I feel that I should refer specially to one of the annexes to my Committee's report. In a letter which I wrote to *The Times* following a letter from the British Chief Rabbi, I endeavored to show that there was little substance in the Jewish objections to the intercalary day. I need not repeat here either his arguments or my reply, but I would emphasize the fact that not only did the Chief Rabbi make no answer to my letter, which was printed in a prominent position at the head of a column, but not a single member of the great Jewish community in Great Britain attempted to refute my arguments. (The chief Rabbi answered this letter briefly at the League Conference.—EDITOR.)

Before concluding, I would venture on one general observation. There would seem to be now established in the leading nations of the world a nucleus of agreed secular opinion which actively desires to see the date of Easter stabilized and the principal defects of the Gregorian Calendar removed, and which accepts the idea of a perpetual Calendar. If this Conference were by its decisions to register the progress that has so far been made, it would mark a definite step forward and would assist the cause of Reform in the future when conditions are more favorable.

So far as Great Britain is concerned, it is well known that we are a people who traditionally tend to tread the *via media,* to compromise between extremes, and I would express my personal conviction, based upon a close contact with the political world and the Press, that if this Conference were to lend its support to the 13-month scheme, the sympathy of

Britain would be irretrievably alienated, and the cause of international Calendar Reform would be not only dead, but damned.

REPORT OF BRITISH PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE

The Parliamentary Committee on Calendar Reform was constituted at the end of July, 1931, following the dissolution of the British Committee of Inquiry. This Committee had found that organizations concerned with commerce and industry, in view of their immediate problems arising out of the general industrial depression, were not inclined to confer upon such a question as Calendar Reform. Its report to the League of Nations Preparatory Committee, therefore, was of necessity—to quote its own words—"inconclusive, and, indeed, negative in character." Subsequently, a request was made from Geneva that it should continue its work and attempt, by means of propaganda, to arouse interest in the question in this country. The Committee decided, however, that it could not undertake such a task.

The Parliamentary Committee appreciated from its inception that there was, broadly speaking, except in respect of a widespread desire for a stabilized Easter, little active interest in Calendar Reform in Great Britain, and little likelihood under existing economic and political conditions of arousing general interest in the subject. These considerations made it necessary to find some practicable method of testing British opinion in the short space of time available. It was decided, therefore, to proceed on what appeared the more likely assumption, namely, that the change to a 13-month calendar would be distasteful to British public opinion unless an overwhelming case could be made out for so drastic a reform, and to test this assumption by means of a miniature referendum.

In preparation for the referendum every effort was made to obtain publicity in the Press for the International Conference in October, and, in spite of the fact that the newspapers were mainly preoccupied with the economic situation and its political consequences, the subject has received more attention during the past two months than ever before. At the same time, it must be admitted that the Press, reflecting public opinion, has still been indisposed to treat the subject as one of more than minor interest. It is noteworthy, however, that such papers as the *Times*, *Morning Post*, *News-Chronicle*, *Evening News* and *Evening Standard* (to mention only papers with a national or London circulation) have printed articles or letters on the subject of Calendar Reform in prominent positions with conspicuous headlines.

As a stimulus and guide to public opinion a pamphlet was prepared under the auspices of the Parliamentary Committee. This summarizes the defects of the existing calendar, and explains succinctly the two schemes for a perpetual calendar which are being considered. It also describes the present position with regard to the stabilization of Easter, calling attention to the fact that the British Parliament has already passed an Act which allows of the suggested reform being speedily introduced if international agreement is reached.

In undertaking a Referendum, it was recognized to be difficult, if not impossible, during the months of August and September, to obtain the considered views of large numbers of public bodies, professional associations and trade organizations, few of which would be likely to hold meetings during these months. It was decided, therefore, that the inquiry should be in the main confined to individuals who might be regarded as typical, rather than specifically representing sections of public opinion.

The individuals were selected as follows: (a) Lord Mayors and Mayors of the Cities and Towns; (b) From the list of many thousands of subscribing members to the League of Nations Union 1000 names were selected at random, the only instructions given to the clerk who copied out the names being that he should, as far as possible, cover the whole country in due proportion; (c) Officials of Employers' and Employees' organizations in their personal and not their official capacity; (d) Members of Parliament.

To every one of these was sent a copy of the pamphlet, a letter explaining what was required of them, and a postcard on which was printed a set of four questions

with spaces left for their replies. The questions were: Do you agree that the defects of the present Calendar make reform desirable? If so, do you definitely prefer the 13-month year to the 12-month year of equal quarters? Or do you think that the British attitude at Geneva should be that it is preferable to retain a 12-month year, unless the 13-month year is shown to be overwhelmingly superior? Do you consider that Easter should be stabilized?

Unfortunately just as preparations were being made for this referendum, the news arrived that the International Conference had been advanced by two weeks, with the result that the work of inquiry had to be hurried, and was consequently less exhaustive than originally planned. Moreover, time was not available for issuing reminders as is generally found necessary in such cases in order to obtain the maximum results. In spite of this, however, a substantial body of typical opinion has been tested, as the following analysis shows:

	For Reform	*For 13-month Year*	*For 12-month Year*	*For Stabilized Easter*
(a)	68	16	47	74
(b)	401	36	356	440
(c)	43	6	35	49
(d)	47	15	29	56

Of the total number of replies received, 82 per cent favor reform of the calendar and about 90 per cent favor the stabilization of Easter. A negligible number of cards were spoiled by contradictory replies, and a very small number indicated that no interest was taken in the question.

In the case of 14 employers' associations, the officials in class (c) above were in a position to reply for their organizations. The number is too small to be of much value as a guide, but it may be worth mentioning that of the 14, three were opposed to reform, seven favored the 12-month scheme, three the 13-month scheme and one supported the stabilization of Easter.

Particulars will be found in an annex to this report of the attitude taken by certain representative bodies on the subject of Calendar Reform, which were consulted by other means than the referendum card.

While the attitude of the popular newspapers suggests that the mass of the population is no more interested in the idea of reforming the calendar than it was 20 years ago in the movement for "Summer Time," the Referendum, in so far as it may be regarded as typical of the more active-minded section of the community, seems to point to certain definite opinions: (1) that there is a positive desire to see the date of Easter stabilized; (2) that where interest can be secured for a recital of the defects of the existing calendar, it is generally recognized that reform is desirable; (3) that the proposal to introduce a 13-month calendar, involving a violent break with established custom, commands little support among those who have given thought to the subject, and (4) that the introduction of a perpetual calendar involving the least possible departure from the present practice would be likely to receive considerable support.

It should be noted here that no attempt has been made by the committee to deal with the religious aspect of Calendar Reform in view of the Preparatory Committee's assurance that such questions would be left to the religious authorities concerned. It may be mentioned, however, that an active propaganda has been conducted in this country, under the auspices of the Chief Rabbi, by the Jewish Committee on Calendar Reform (supported by an organization described as the Religious Liberty Association) against a perpetual calendar. In this connection a letter signed by the Chief Rabbi appeared in the *Times* on September 15th to which a reasoned reply was sent, and the Chief Rabbi has not returned to the subject.

Reference should be made to the claims by the advocates of the 13-month calendar that they have found substantial support for their scheme in this country. One statement made in the Press on their behalf makes the unsupported claim that a canvass of the country showed a 70 per cent vote in favor of the scheme. There would seem

to be as little foundation for this suggestion as for the parallel claim that 262,000,000 people in the world support the 13-month scheme. The most substantial backing in Britain for a 13-month year comes from the railway groups which do actually at present, for accounting purposes, divide the year into 13 four-week periods. It has not been possible to discuss with the railways the alternative 12-month scheme, but it should be easy to show that their present system could as readily be adapted to a perpetual year of four 13-week periods as to a perpetual year of 13 four-week periods.

Without expressing any opinion on behalf of the Committee as to the merits of Calendar Reform, or of the two schemes under discussion, it may be affirmed (1) that there is an active British public opinion in favor of the stabilization of Easter; (2) that informed public opinion recognizes the defects of the existing calendar; (3) that there is no evidence of general support or approval of the proposed 13-month year, but (4) that there would seem to be good reason for believing that, in times more propitious than the present for consideration of this question, a scheme for a reformed 12-Month Calendar would be likely to commend itself to British public opinion.

ANNEX: In view of the exhaustive efforts that were made a few months ago by the official Committee of Inquiry to obtain considered views of representative bodies like the Federation of British Industries, and the Associated Chambers of Commerce, it was thought that no useful purpose would be served by canvassing the opinions of these organizations after so short an interval, more particularly as the industrial and commercial situation had changed, if anything, for the worse rather than for the better. Discreet enquiries were, however, made in certain important quarters, with the following results:

(1) *LONDON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.* The Secretary stated that some years ago the Chamber adopted the view originally put forward by Lord Desborough that, by reason of the magnitude of the task of reforming the whole calendar it would be desirable, as a matter of tactics, in the first place to fix the date of Easter. That attitude had been maintained ever since.

(2) *NATIONAL CHAMBER OF TRADE.* At the last annual conference in May, the following motion was proposed: "That this Conference supports the principle of Calendar simplification, and its operation on the lines outlined by the Fixed Calendar League and that intimation of this support be conveyed to the British Calendar Reform Committee of Inquiry." After a discussion an amendment was proposed dropping all words after Simplification, so that the Chamber has pledged itself to the principle of Calendar Reform, but has gone no further for the present. The Secretary states that it is hoped to include the question in the Agenda for the Annual Conference next April, and adds that it has made successive representations for a movement to be made towards stabilization of Easter, which it has repeatedly approved.

(3) *TRADES UNION CONGRESS.* An enquiry was addressed to the General Secretary, asking him (a) when the resolution in favor of a 13-month year was passed by his Congress; (b) whether it represents the considered view of the Congress following a discussion on the subject; and (c) whether any alternative schemes of reform were brought to the notice of the meeting in question. The General Secretary in his reply stated that the resolution was passed at Swansea in 1928. He made no reference to question (b), and in regard to (c) said that no other proposal was made than that submitted by the mover of the resolution.

An interesting experiment was made spontaneously at the Stranmillis Training College, Belfast. The Master of Method at that College discussed and explained the pamphlet on Calendar Reform with a body of students numbering 113, from 19 to 24 years of age. He then took a vote, with the following result: In favor of reform, 88; opposed to reform, 25. Of the 88, 70 preferred the 12-month equal-quarter year, and 18 a 13-month year. All except 9 favored the stabilization of Easter.

Thus, in whatever direction public opinion has been tested, substantially the same results have been arrived at; an overwhelming majority for a stabilized Easter, a large majority for reform, and a strongly marked preference among the reformers, varying from 2 to 1 to 10 to 1, for a 12-month year.

SWISS TAKE A FIRM STAND

Abstracted from several addresses by Professor Emile Marchand, official delegate of the Swiss government, at the League of Nations.

THE SWISS government, for which I speak, has authorized its delegation to refuse any scheme for a 13-month year, and to insist upon the economic advantages of a perpetual calendar of 12 months.

Swiss public opinion, as indicated in our referendums and consultations, is very strongly in favor of a 12-month year—by which we mean a revision which will make the calendar perpetual and equalize the four quarters of the year with each quarter containing three months of 31, 30, and 30 days.

The 12-month plan is bound to have a far more persuasive appeal to the man in the street, who after all forms the vast majority of the population of every country. Why discuss a proposal which is incomprehensible to the average citizen, when there is an alternative proposal before us which allows the maintenance of the familiar 12-month division and meets all the essential needs of the situation?

Why discuss a proposal which has nothing to recommend it except a superficial adaptability for purposes of comparative statistics? Precise scientific comparability between the different months of the same year can never be attained anyway, owing not only to seasonal differences, but also to regional variations. It is far more important to secure an approximate comparability between the same months in two or more different years.

In considering the results of a shift to a 13-month calendar, we must admit first of all that it would disturb the results of all comparisons with the past. Moreover, it would disturb historians, meteorologists and others who have painstakingly gathered masses of data and figures applicable to a 12-months calendar only. Above all, it would practically eliminate the quarterly and half-yearly divisions of the year, which are of great value.

The most important measure of time is the year itself. And people are in the habit necessarily of dividing the year into convenient halves and quarters, which are indeed essential subdivisions. Any scheme of calendar reform which eliminates half years and quarters entails many disadvantages from the economic and social point of view. For instance, take the case of insurance contracts which provide in most cases for the payment of quarterly or half-yearly premiums. Some of these contracts have ten, twenty or more years to run, while others will continue through the lifetime of the contracting individual.

There is also the matter of leases, rents and various types of business contracts. The half-year in a 13-month calendar falls in the middle of a

month—and a month whose very name is unknown to present courts and legislatures.

It is vain to delude ourselves with the theory that absolute world-wide stabilization and comparability can be secured in the calendar, if for no other reason than that a number of local and movable feasts divide the year differently according to each country. The adoption of a calendar with uniform 4-week months would not conduce to any greater regularity than under an easily attainable 12-month revision.

Actually, in fact, the 13-month calendar does not consist of 13 months of 28 days, but rather of 12 months of 28 days plus one month of 29 days. So that not even this proposal secures an absolute uniformity.

But even under a 12-month perpetual calendar, it is possible to use a four-week period for accounting or statistical purposes with exactly the same precision as under the proposal of the 13-month reformers. In compiling certain statistics, such as those for health services, the 4-weeks period is a convenient one. But the accuracy of this accounting period depends, not upon a 13-month arrangement, but upon a perpetual calendar, whereby any given day of the month falls forever upon the same weekday. I have found that most statisticians who employ such a 4-weekly period, would prefer a 12-month perpetual calendar, which would entail a less radical break with ancient and accepted customs.

I would point out, also, that daily life would be less monotonous under a 12-month calendar than under the proposed 13-month revision. Moreover, the latter, by creating a new month, would obliterate all historical events connected with the 28 days embodied in this supplementary month. This would mean upsetting the whole system of legal engagements assumed in the spheres of insurance, banking, interest on coupons and shares, mortgage loans, and so on. It would not only create difficulties in economic and social life, but would also disturb the scientific and historical activity of nations.

From a practical viewpoint the 13-month calendar means doing 13 times annually what hitherto has been done only 12 times a year—and this inevitably involves a grave loss of time and money in business operations, banking, commerce, industry and transport. It means increased expense in drawing up balance sheets, calculating wages, publishing monthly reviews, etc.

Advocates of the 13-month calendar propose to move Christmas Day from December 25th to December 23rd, in order to make it fall perpetually on a Monday. This, I think, is interfering once too often with custom and tradition.

In Switzerland there have been no conspicuous exceptions to the universal endorsement of the 12-month equal quarters plan for a perpetual calendar. Some minorities have raised objections on religious grounds,

but I feel that they have exaggerated the unfavorable effects of the proposed reform. The League of Nation's Preparatory Committee has already expressed this view in the words: "The fears expressed by certain minorities are perhaps exaggerated. For example, in the case of the Jews, the obligation of school attendance on Saturdays, which at present exists in a number of countries, has not given rise to any protests. As regards the exercise of the professions, if the Sabbath did not necessarily coincide with Saturday, the situation would not be materially different for Jews from that which existed a few years ago when business activities were pursued on Saturdays the same as on other days."

If the new calendar is adopted, these minorities will not fail to perceive that it is less unfavorable than they had imagined.

On the other hand, scientific circles have expressed themselves in favor of the perpetual calendar. In this connection may I refer to the recommendation passed by the Union of Astronomical Societies.

In Switzerland, one of the State departments, that of Posts, Telegraphs and Telephones, attaches special importance to a reform which will not only stabilize Easter, but which will make Christmas always fall on a fixed weekday, in view of the density of the traffic at that time. You are already familiar with the fact that in the 12-month equal-quarter calendar, Christmas falls on a Monday.

DEATH OF COLONEL McCULLOUGH

COLONEL ERNEST McCULLOUGH, one of the earliest advocates in America of Calendar Reform, died on October 1 at his home in Long Island City. He was 64 years old. Readers of the Journal of Calendar Reform will recall the very interesting and valuable article on "Days and Deities" which he contributed to the June issue. At the time of his death he had several other articles on various phases of calendar reform in course of preparation.

For the greater part of his life, Colonel McCullough was engaged in general engineering. He was a graduate of the Chicago Institute of Technology and the San Francisco School of Engineering. His professional work was largely with the Anaconda Copper Co., the International Combustion Engineering Corp., the Solvay Co. and various large contracting concerns.

He served with distinction as an engineering officer in the World War, being wounded in action at Cambrai. Later he became chief of the artillery section of the Chemical Warfare Service.

Colonel McCullough's skill as an author and editor is indicated by 16 books and numerous articles for magazines and engineernig periodicals. For several years he was the Chief Editor of the Building Age and associate editor of the American Architect and of the Railway Age. He was a member of many professional societies and a medallist of the British and French engineering institutes.

GANDHI ON CALENDAR

Mahatma Gandhi, the great nationalist leader of India, was in London at the British Imperial Conference during the period of the League of Nations' sessions on Calendar Reform. The following statement from him was given to The World Calendar Association and transmitted to the League for the information of the delegates.

IN INDIA there are several calendars in current use. Several racial groups have their own calendars, in which the year begins on a different date and ends on a different date. In these calendars different holidays are observed, which results in much confusion.

It would be a splendid thing if our 350,000,000 people could have a single national unified calendar. As most of the Indian calendars are arranged on a twelve-month basis, it would obviously be easier to meet on this common ground. I am in favor of such a calendar. I am in favor of a standardized calendar for the whole world, just as I am in favor of a uniform coinage for all countries, and a supplementary artificial language (like Esperanto, for example) for all peoples.

I have been informed of, and I welcome, the international movement for calendar reform. The efforts made by the Americans in this direction are particularly laudable because they represent a pure philanthropy. But their progress is hampered by national jealousies and national short-sightedness.

Recently I received a request from some of the promoters of calendar reform to attend their meeting at Geneva. I replied that while I was in favor of it, my special activities would not permit me identifying myself actively with their movement.

I am always ready to endorse any honest movement which will help to unify the peoples of the world.

M K Gandhi

VOICE OF THE COLLEGES

Extracts from report submitted to the League of Nations by Charles Clayton Wylie, Secretary of the University Association for the Study of Calendar Reform, October 12, 1931.

THE OPINION of the officers of this Association is that in the United States the majority who have given calendar revision any thought are in favor of revising the present calendar. There is a strong preference for a 12-month revision rather than for the more radical 13-month plan.

Excepting users of 13-period auxiliary calendars, no group or firm has reported to us as preferring the 13-month plan.

The ablest men in the United States are, however, not as yet agreed. Famous men are reporting in favor of the 12-month revision, in favor of the 13-month plan, as opposed to any calendar change, and as indifferent.

This makes it unwise to consider a change for such an early date as January 1, 1933. The fact that the government year books for 1933 such as The Nautical Almanac, have already been distributed should eliminate that date, even apart from other considerations.

As far as the United States is concerned, it appears that some form of 12-month revision to take effect January 1, 1939, might well be considered, but it is evident that there is first need for an educational campaign to acquaint the public with the problems of calendar reform, and there is also need for a more thorough study of the facts underlying these problems. The publicity work can be effectively carried on by such organizations as the National Committee on Calendar Simplification, and The World Calendar Association, but it appears to us that the investigation of the underlying problems can be best carried on by colleges, universities and research institutions. A list of such problems is being prepared for submission to our members.

During the past year, the University Association for the Study of Calendar Reform has canvassed representative groups in the United States, including bankers, railroad officials, educators and astronomers. It is believed that the more than 1300 replies received should give a fairly accurate cross section of the minds of these groups.

Our questionnaires were similar in form, each including information summarized from the League of Nations' report, and outlining the two more favored plans for calendar simplification. As the Association membership includes both 12-month and 13-month revisionists, it was necessary to rewrite these explanations many times before an agreement was reached on the material for the questionnaires.

TRANSPORTATION OPINION: Of the 197 replies received from

railroad and transportation officials, a substantial majority favored calendar reform, with a preponderance of opinion supporting the 12-month plan of revision. The results were as follows:

Favoring calendar reform	61 per cent
Opposing calendar reform	36 per cent
Favoring 13-month revision	17 per cent
Favoring 12-month revision	63 per cent

BANKERS' QUESTIONNAIRE: The 586 replies received from bank and trust company officials indicate for this group a conservative attitude toward the whole question. Indeed, those opposing calendar reform have a very small plurality over those supporting it and those failing to answer that question. Many sent with their replies a statement that the existing business depression is so serious that the writers believe the present is an inopportune time to consider any change in the calendar. The following are the percentages shown by the bankers' replies:

Favoring calendar reform	47 per cent
Opposing calendar reform	48 per cent
Favoring 13-month revision	19 per cent
Favoring 12-month revision	55 per cent

EDUCATORS: Among educators the results are more decisive, and in agreement with the trend of articles published in the learned journals in recent years. Of the 400 replies received from university and college professors, a strong majority favors calendar reform; and, as with the other groups, there is a decided preference for the 12-month plan. The percentages are as follows:

Favoring calendar reform	90 per cent
Opposing calendar reform	8 per cent
Favoring 13-month revision	31 per cent
Favoring 12-month revision	61 per cent

ASTRONOMERS: The 134 replies received from members of the American Astronomical Society also show a good majority for calendar reform, and a decided preference for the 12-month revision over the 13-month plan. On the question of revising the Gregorian rule for leap year (as suggested by Dr. Marvin of the U. S. Weather Bureau) there is no majority, but a good plurality for those opposing. The following are the results:

Favoring calendar reform	67 per cent
Opposing calendar reform	28 per cent
Favoring the 13-month revision	25 per cent
Favoring the 12-month revision	62 per cent
Favoring new leap-year rule	37 per cent
Opposing new leap-year rule	45 per cent

Although strongly in favor of revision, astronomers as a group are much more conservative than university men as a whole. They are more familiar with the difficulties attending any calendar change, and furthermore, are probably more affected by such changes, and have recently been inconvenienced by a reform attempted in connection with the astronomical day and mean time.

Some of the senior men in the United States Naval Observatory and others who have investigated the question of a new rule for leap year, sent remarks which may be summarized as follows: The Gregorian rule should eventually be revised, but the rules now in most favor agree until A.D. 2400 to A.D. 4000. Our present formulæ for length of the year are based on only 150 to 200 years of accurate observations, and will probably be considered quite out of date by persons living at that time. It is, therefore, hardly worth while for us formally to adopt a revision which may be discarded before taking effect.

As a comment from a scientific institution, we submit a letter giving the opinion of the staff of Department of Research in Terrestrial Magnetism, Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington, D. C. In the absence of Director L. A. Bauer because of illness, the letter was signed by Acting Director J. A. Fleming:

"I beg to state in answer to your questions as submitted that we all favor a revision of the calendar for a 12-month year. We believe that such a revision would doubtless help in business matters. We do not favor revising the Gregorian leap-year rule.

"There is a very real objection to the division of the year into thirteen, as in astronomy there is a real need for a division into equal parts, in order to compare variations in our fields of research which bear relations, for example, to the northern summer and to the southern summer, and for which no division of a 13-month year would permit.

"Of great importance in disfavor of a 13-month year would be the fact that all the tabulations of magnetic and electric data have now been compiled for many years on the 12-month basis and the task of rearranging these to a 13-month basis would be practically impossible, under the existing conditions of limited personnel in scientific endeavor. On the other hand, the comparison of published data pertaining to the present calendar would be but little affected by the use of the revised 12-month calendar.

"In our present calendar the unequal months are a source of annoyance, which would be minimized by a symmetrical arrangement of the inequalities, for example, by making the first month in each quarter a month of 31 days and the following months 30 days, as suggested by one plan."

It will be seen that the staff of this scientific institution agrees with educators and astronomers on the desirability of revision, and on prefer-

ring twelve months. On the revision of the rule for leap year, these scientists agree with the astronomers.

Institutions represented in the Membership of the University Association for the Study of Calendar Reform are as follows:

UNIVERSITIES: Alabama University, Boston University, University of California, University of Chicago, University of Cincinnati, Colgate University, Columbia University, Cornell University, Drake University, Duke University, Emory University, University of Florida, Harvard University, University of Idaho, University of Illinois, University of Iowa, Johns Hopkins University, Louisiana State University, University of Mississippi, University of Missouri, University of Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy, University of Nebraska, New York University, Northwestern University, Notre Dame University, Ohio State University, Omaha Municipal University, University of Pittsburgh, Princeton University, Purdue University, University of Richmond, Southern Methodist University, Stanford University, University of Texas, University of Washington, Washington University, Wesleyan University, Western Reserve University, University of Wisconsin, Yale University.

COLLEGES: Amherst College, Beloit College, Berea College, Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Columbia College, Creston Junior College, Dartmouth College, Defiance College, Franklin & Marshall College, Georgetown College, Grove City College, Hiram College, Kansas State College, Kenyon College, Knox College, Lafayette College, Marietta College, Michigan State Teachers College, Midland College, Mills College, North Dakota Agricultural College, Oberlin College, Ohio Wesleyan, Oklahoma A. & M. College, Parsons College, Peabody College, Rutgers College, South Dakota State College, Swarthmore College, Tufts College, Union College, Upper Iowa College.

MISCELLANEOUS: Alfred Theological Seminary, Colgate Rochester Divinity School, California Institute of Technology, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Dominion Astrophysical Observatory, Dudley Observatory, U. S. Naval Observatory, Western Theological Seminary.

JAPAN AGAINST 13-MONTH PLAN

Declaration by Motoharu Shichida, Secretary of the Japanese Delegation at the League Conference

JAPAN is not able to accept any reform which would give the year 13 months, for reasons which it is not necessary to explain fully. But I wish to point out that such a plan would cause certain inconveniences for countries like ours, which from custom attach a particular importance to the unity of day and of month, without giving the week as much emphasis as do other countries.

My government recognizes the faults and serious inconveniences which exist in the present calendar system. It has not yet come to a firm decision as to whether the time is now ripe for calendar reform. But the question being one of universal character, our delegation is ready to give the problem its fullest consideration.

AS SEEN BY THE NAVY

By Rear Admiral F. B. Upham
Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, U. S. Navy Department

Calendar Reform as viewed by navigators and astronomers was presented to the League of Nations in a statement from Rear Admiral Upham, in which he said: "My interest in the 12-month calendar advocated by The World Calendar Association prompted me to refer it to the Naval Observatory for comment on its merits from the point of view of that institution, the personnel of which are naval officers and astronomers. I am pleased to say that their comments are entirely favorable and they recommend its adoption. As compared with its one competitor, the 13-month calendar, it offers to astronomers and to mariners the very practical advantages of (a) more nearly equal divisions of the seasons into 3-month periods, (b) the gain of sidereal time on mean time would be uniform at two hours per month, and (c) the stars would change at the same regular rate,—none of which would be true on a 13-month calendar." In the following article, Rear Admiral Upham makes further comment on his position.

MUCH has been written to show the effect calendar reform will have on business, on bankers, on railroads, on the churches; in fact, on practically every activity of modern life except those most vitally concerned—the mariners and the astronomers.

Man can make laws, agitate for reforms, or establish and violate conventions, but when any of these acts of man run afoul of the laws of the universe they are as futile as would be the efforts of a child to stop Niagara Falls.

Time can be measured only by accurate observations of the celestial bodies. The day is the unit of time and is the period of one complete revolution of the earth on its axis.

The most accurate measure of time is the sidereal day—the time elapsing between two successive meridian passages of the First Point of Aries. Due to the earth's orbit being an ellipse and to its moving in the ecliptic instead of in the equator, the component of its motion parallel to the equator is not uniform. For this reason a fictitious sun is assumed, which moves so that its component parallel to the equator moves uniformly. This fictitious sun is known as the "mean" sun. The apparent movement of the mean sun causes its distance from this reference point in the celestial sphere to increase at a uniform rate. Beginning on the day and hour when the mean sun crosses the celestial equator, it apparently marches majestically along its course, returning to the initial point after having completed the three hundred and sixty degrees of angular movement. The time consumed in making this complete passage is one year, and

has been measured and calculated by astronomers thousands upon thousands of times.

Nothing can be done by man to change these celestial movements. But he can set up for his own convenience certain periods or intervals, as standards with which to indicate definite divisions of time.

These standards have been in existence for ages and anything that tends to disrupt these accepted standards can only lead to endless confusion and loss.

This is particularly true with respect to the effect of such changes on navigators and astronomers. Hundreds of thousands of men all over the world would be confused and uncertain, and their labors would be doubled without any compensating gain.

The whole must be divided into equal parts; which in turn become the whole for further subdivision, and these again are subdivided. The introduction of fractions in any of these parts will enormously increase the labor of all concerned with no gain.

The twelve monthly divisions must be retained in any calendar reform. The apparent positions of the stars with respect to the earth change 360 degrees in a year, or at the rate of thirty degrees per month, or two hours in time per month.

If a 13-month calendar is attempted, all the astronomical records back as far as they extend will have to be corrected in order to make them comparable with future work.

The fundamental astronomy with which all national observatories are concerned, and all the publications based on their observations, would have to be modified to render them readily usable with a 13-month calendar. If there was any commensurate gain it might be considered, but there is nothing to be gained and all to be lost by such a change.

Thirteen is an unwieldy number, inconvenient to use and impossible to divide into whole parts such as are common in the use of time—seasons, halves, quarters, thirds, etc. Each period would be 1/13th of the whole cycle of 360 degrees. All calculations would therefore be based on 27 and 9/13ths degrees as the monthly change. Need I continue this calculation any longer to show what a cumbersome, hopeless, and entirely unnecessary complication is introduced?

On the other hand, 1/12th of 360 is 30 degrees or two hours of time. How simple by contrast!

And what applies to astronomers applies with even greater force to navigators and mariners. They are not safely located in well-constructed observatories, they are at sea. Calculations for the determination of their positions at sea constitute their most important duty while at sea. Upon their accuracy depends the safety of the ship, the preservation of valuable cargoes, and the actual lives of all hands on board. When you

introduce complications into these calculations, you enormously increase the hazards and risks of the sea. You unnecessarily jeopardize the safety of every mariner.

If we can learn anything from history, just remember that the Gregorian calendar was introduced in 1582 by Gregory VIII upon the advice of Clavius and that some important countries have only recently adopted it after about three hundred and thirty years. How long it would take the world to accept a 13-month year cannot be estimated.

Think of the psychological influence against anything labeled thirteen. Hotels do not dare to have a room No. 13 for guests. Nine people out of ten say they—thank the Lord—are not superstitious, but they will not light the third cigarette on the same match, even while they are loudly protesting their freedom from superstition. They will quickly pick up a few grains of salt accidentally spilled and throw it over their left shoulder into someone's eye, thereby precipitating the fight they hoped to avoid.

After the change from the Julian to the Gregorian calendar in England, over one-third of all the litigation for the following 70 years was caused by the change.

After several hundred years—the most recent ones—of astronomical observations and calculations and the indoctrination of navigational methods based on those calculations, what do you think would happen if suddenly all the dates were changed according to a 13-month year schedule? The Admiralty courts would be full for the next hundred years.

The twelve month calendar must be preserved.

WORLD CRISIS DEMANDS ATTENTION

Declaration by Dr. G. Kaisenberg, Delegate of Germany at the League Conference

SOME speakers have erred, I think, in saying that the present world economic crisis prevents serious consideration of calendar reform at this time. They have stated that "in the existing depression, it is necessary to concentrate attention on problems of more vital importance."

The German delegation takes an opposite view. In fact, it is the present economic crisis which seems to us the most urgent argument for breaking away from old institutions created for other periods and operating to hamper and injure modern economic activity.

This is the reason why the great majority of organizations consulted by the German Committee have pronounced themselves in favor of calendar reform. It is a reason which the German Government has made its own and supports emphatically.

In Germany the inconveniences of the present calendar have been discussed very thoroughly with industrial organizations, both on the side of employers and employed, and with representatives of education and science. We find that the inconveniences of the present calendar are generally recognized—the inequality of the different parts of the year, the instability of the calendar and of the date of Easter.

I do not want to waste your time over these details, which are so well known to you, but I wish to catalogue them briefly to emphasize the tremendous importance of the economic factors which in our opinion make the immediate consideration of calendar reform desirable.

FROM AN OBSERVER'S NOTEBOOK

By CHARLES D. MORRIS

Editor of the Journal of Calendar Reform

OFFICIAL delegations from 41 governments attended the Fourth General Conference on Communications and Transit, called by the League of Nations. Calendar Reform was one of several subjects on the agenda of the Conference, but the other subjects were of subordinate interest, and the greater part of the two weeks allotted to the Conference was devoted to the Calendar.

Surely never before in the history of calendar development has there been a meeting like this one. Among the really great nations of the world, only Russia was absent. Here were representatives of Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland and the other European governments. Here, too, was America, South and North. And as spokesmen for Africa and Asia there were delegates from Egypt, Japan, China and Siam.

Inasmuch as the official government delegates were in most cases diplomatic officials or foreign office functionaries, without specialized knowledge of the Calendar, several of the more important delegations were accompanied by "experts" whose duty it was to give advice on the technical phases of the discussion.

Thus the German delegation was accompanied by the very distinguished expert, Dr. H. Platzer, director-general of the Statistical Office of the Reich. The French delegation had the services of two experts, M. Andre Bertaut and M. Rene Mayer. The Japanese delegation was advised by M. Kobayashi, secretary of the Ministry of Communications. The Dutch delegation was accompanied by J. F. H. Geraets, director of the Ministry of Labor, Commerce and Industry. The Canadian delegate made frequent use of the services of Moses B. Cotsworth, director of the International Fixed Calendar League.

Great Britain was the only important country which dispensed with any expert assistance. England's lone delegate, Sir John Baldwin of the Imperial Foreign Office, is one of the keenest and most experienced permanent officials in British diplomacy, and his ability was perhaps never better shown than in the way he promptly took a place of unostentatious but unmistakable leadership in this gathering of 41 nations.

It was soon clear why Sir John did not require the services of any expert on the technical side of the calendar discussion. For he promptly told the meeting that "His Majesty's Government" was not yet ready to express any opinion on calendar reform, and that he did not propose to be

manœuvred into a position which would commit or prejudice the British government in any decision it might later choose to make. He was not even sure that there were defects in the calendar, and he certainly was not in a position to agree with any deductions or conclusions that might be drawn by the Conference. He was willing to have his attention called to alleged irregularities and suggested remedies, but he felt that the Conference should not go further than to take note of such arguments as were presented, without expressing an opinion as to their accuracy or justification.

On only one subject connected with the calendar was Sir John willing to commit himself—and that was the stabilization of Easter, on which the British Parliament had already legislated. And the legislation which Parliament had enacted, he felt, should be the vote of this Conference.

Sir John's attitude, coupled with his overwhelming influence and the predominant part England has always played in the counsels of the League of Nations, left the other delegates in a quandary. They could talk and argue as much as they pleased, but whenever they tried to put their arguments into concrete form, the British lion growled gently but effectively.

The final result of the Conference, in fact, was in accordance with Sir John's wishes. He was the chairman of the committee which drafted the final report, and the report therefore is clear and definite on only one subject—the stabilization of Easter. The paragraphs which deal generally with Calendar Reform follow Sir John's suggestion that the Conference merely take note of the arguments, without expressing any opinion.

Sir John would have preferred that the report be limited to a bald statement that "the time is not favorable for calendar reform," but in the drafting committee he yielded gracefully to the plea of the League Secretariat that some vague summary of the activities of the Conference should be included, merely to justify the time and labor spent on it. He yielded, however, solely on condition that the wording should be qualified in every sentence, so that it committed nobody to a definite course. And the last paragraph of the report includes a significant sentence which cautions the League Secretariat against taking a propaganda attitude either for or against any particular scheme of calendar reform.

I would not convey the impression that Sir John was an obstructionist, without any constructive purpose. He was certainly the ablest of all the delegates present, and from the beginning he seemed to sense more clearly than the others that the League of Nations, in its zeal for calendar reform, had already advanced farther along this path than general public opinion in his own or other countries.

In conversation with Sir John, I found his attitude discerning and sympathetic. He is personally convinced that calendar reform will come, in due course—but he is also certain that a longer period of public educa-

tion is necessary before any international gathering of diplomats can begin to inaugurate actual legislation on the subject.

In England, for instance, the campaign on behalf of a 13-month calendar has had an unfortunate effect, because the radical nature of this proposal has prejudiced public opinion against all calendar reform. In fact, until the organization last summer of the British Parliamentary Committee, few people in England were aware that there was any alternative plan under consideration at the League of Nations.

Sir John Baldwin, assigned at a few hours' notice to the post of British representative at the League Conference, sensed soon after his arrival in Geneva that there had been a certain intangible "stacking of the cards" in the preparations for the meeting. He felt a danger that the various delegations might be stampeded into some hasty action on Calendar Reform, owing to their ignorance of the subject, which later would prove unwise and ill-advised. All his British instinct and training dictated caution and resistance to hurried action.

To a considerable degree, I approved Sir John's attitude. While personally I would have preferred a more constructive result from this imposing eight-day meeting of delegates from all parts of the world, I none the less appreciated and indorsed his feeling that public acceptance must precede any effective attempt at international legislation.

As far as the British public is concerned, the best indication of its probable attitude in the future is to be found in the sober and dignified report submitted by the British Parliamentary Committee and presented to the League Conference in a brief address by Mr. Stelling, honorary secretary of the Committee. And one of the most impressive and dramatic moments of the entire Conference was his solemn peroration, which I think none of those present are likely to forget. "Gentlemen," he said, "if this body were to lend its support to the 13-month scheme, the sympathy of Britain would be irretrievably alienated, and the cause of Calendar Reform would be not only dead, but damned."

Good, honest, Anglo-Saxon words, which probably would have been echoed by the United States and Canada, if these countries had been represented by delegates of the calibre of Rear Admiral Upham, Professor H. Parker Willis, George Gordon Battle, and others whose voices have recently been heard on the subject of Calendar Reform.

Out of the 41 delegations present, only a trifling number were in a position to express the official views of their governments on the alternative plans for calendar reform. The others were either "uninstructed," or like Sir John Baldwin were carefully instructed to take no sides, to make no commitments, and to qualify their votes as subject to reference.

The list of governments which are permanent members of the Council of the League of Nations consists of France, Germany, Great Brit-

ain, Italy and Japan. These are the "great nations" whose voices are naturally paramount. Here was the way they lined up in the Conference:

FRANCE: No commitment; inconclusive inquiries among commercial interests indicate a certain interest in the 13-month plan, but the public is uninformed and indifferent.

GERMANY: No commitment, but a conviction that the world economic crisis emphasizes the need for calendar reform; questionnaires conducted by the German government show a preference for the 12-month revision as compared with the 13-month proposal.

GREAT BRITAIN: No commitment; the time is not ripe for calendar reform; British public opinion, as summarized by the Parliamentary Committee, is opposed to a 13-month revision, but under more favorable conditions, would listen sympathetically to proposals for a revised 12-month calendar.

ITALY: No commitment; but a definite opposition to any 13-month calendar.

JAPAN: No commitment, but a definite statement that the 13-month revision would not be acceptable to the Japanese government or people. (See page 147.)

Among the other nations represented at the Conference, the following expressions of opinion deserve mention:

BELGIUM: No commitment; official and popular opinion favors the 12-month equal-quarter proposal; definite opposition to any 13-month year.

CANADA: Definite instructions from the Canadian government to support the 13-month perpetual calendar.

GREECE: Definite instructions from the Greek government to support the 12-month equal-quarter calendar.

IRISH FREE STATE: No commitment; definite opposition to any 13-month year.

NETHERLANDS: No commitment; definite opposition to any 13-month year; popular opinion favorable to a 12-month revision.

NORWAY: No commitment; no preference expressed.

PORTUGAL: No commitment; questionnaires have shown a favorable opinion to the 13-month plan.

SPAIN: No commitment; delegates favor a perpetual calendar.

SWEDEN: No commitment; opposition to any 13-month year; popular interest favors 12-month revision.

SWITZERLAND: Definite instructions from the Swiss government to support the 12-month equal-quarter calendar.

UNITED STATES: No commitment; the delegate stated that "the government does not advocate any individual calendar."

YUGOSLAVIA: Definite instructions to support 13-month plan; later suggested abandoning the perpetual feature.

Among the important delegations, then, only four were in a position to commit their governments. Canada and Yugoslavia favored the 13-month plan. Switzerland and Greece supported the 12-month revision. Canada's position was reinforced by the attendance of Dr. C. F. Marvin, delegate of the United States government but without any official mandate and exceedingly careful to explain that he did not speak for his government. Danzig supported the 12-month plan, and China advocated a novel 13-month calendar invented by a Chinese scholar.

Switzerland was the spear-head of the 12-month revisionists, and be-

sides Greece, it had a qualified support from Italy, Japan, Belgium, Irish Free State, Holland, Sweden, Germany and others. On balance, it appeared that the 12-month plan was far more popular among the delegates than the scheme so vocally supported by Dr. Marvin and his associates.

The third day of the Conference was devoted to discussion of the perpetual feature. Ten delegations expressed definite preference for a perpetual calendar. The Netherlands and Italy stood out for a non-perpetual calendar of the 12-month equal-quarter variety, and Switzerland also expressed a willingness to accept this as a step toward complete reform. Yugoslavia and the Canadian expert, Mr. Cotsworth, suggested a 13-month non-perpetual calendar.

In the words of the chairman: "Most governments have not adopted any definite attitude as their own and their representatives therefore cannot express an opinion on the various proposals which have been made. But as far as reform is desired, the preference appears to be for a perpetual calendar rather than for a reform of the non-perpetual type. Mere regularization of the quarters, by transferring one day from August to February, does not appear to find any support."

Organizations which had been invited to attend the sessions of the Conference in the capacity of "observers" included the World Calendar Association, the University Association for the Study of Calendar Reform, the British Parliamentary Committee on Calendar Reform, and several similar groups from other countries, together with a number of delegates from religious bodies, including Jews, Seventh-Day Adventists, and a representative of the Church of England.

Addresses by these observers were invited by the Conference and were presented mostly on the opening day of the sittings. As at the sessions of the Preparatory Commlttee in June, the religious observers were particularly strenuous in their opposition to the 13-month revision, and indeed to any form of perpetual calendar.

The representative of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Canon E. W. J. Hellins, of course, was an exception to these objectors. He spoke briefly, outlining the position of the Church of England in regard to the stabilization of Easter, and then expressed his personal sympathy with the calendar reform movement.

Although the League had expressly excluded all religious aspects of the subject from the consideration of the Conference, leaving them for later decision by an international body of religious leaders, it became obvious that many of the delegates were impressed by the opposition of the Jews and Seventh-Day Adventists, finding themselves compelled to consider the possible religious objections that might be encountered in their own countries.

Advocates of the 13-month revision during the last days of the Con-

ference permitted the final report to include a suggestion for a non-perpetual 13-month calendar—a concession which would apparently reduce their plan to the status of an auxiliary calendar for the sole use of those who find it convenient and suitable.

I am happy to say that there was no similar surrender on the part of proponents of the 12-month plan. Switzerland, it is true, suggested a 12-month non-perpetual calendar, but merely as a stage to a perpetual one.

The final action of the Conference leaves the question of Calendar Reform in statu quo, but with a new emphasis and importance derived from the consideration which it received in this unprecedented official gathering. In the main, the report conveys the impression which Sir John wished it to convey—that the time is not favorable for calendar reform, that the next step is with individual governments rather than with the League, and that education of public opinion is vitally important.

The League's activity has served to bring Calendar Reform out into the limelight, and henceforth the revision of the Calendar will not be a completely unknown subject in any country.

As for the immediate future, it is obvious that friends of Calendar Reform must zealously go forward with their task of popular education, having as their ultimate object the enlistment of political and legislative agencies in each country.

Stabilization of Easter is already far on the road to accomplishment, thanks to the work of its advocates in England, where Parliament has passed a law which puts the new Easter into effect as soon as other nations adopt it. This result, indeed, points to the proper method for carrying on the cause of calendar reform. Once the supreme legislative body in any great country has enacted a law in favor of the 12-month equal-quarter calendar, the most important move toward adoption will have been achieved. Whether the first country to take this step will be England, Germany or the United States is immaterial. England was the nation which gave daylight saving to the world; the United States fathered Standard Time. Either of these countries, or perhaps Germany, is in a position to make the perfected 12-month calendar a reality.

It rests with each one of us, who have studied the problem and realize the need and the opportunity, to do our share toward a wider public education and eventual national legislation.

FRENCH BUSINESS OPINION

By Paul Louis Hervier, Secretary General of the Paris Intransigeant

The 13-month calendar has been emphatically rejected by the Chamber of Commerce of Paris, which took up the question of Calendar Reform at the request of the French Ministry of Commerce. The Chamber's report lays emphasis on the chaotic effect such change would have on all existing commercial and economic life.

INTERPRETING THE REPORT

By Elisabeth Achelis
President of The World Calendar Association

IT IS a real pleasure to commend the wise action of the League of Nations in handing calendar reform back to the various governments and public opinions for further study. It was generally recognized at the Conference that the time is not favorable for such a great change. General public opinion is not sufficiently informed upon the disadvantages the present calendar brings to its users and the advantages to be gained from an improved and regulated plan. Intensive educational work among all nations is needed.

Calendar reform is a world-movement that cannot be stayed. It affects every individual, every home, community and nation. It touches social and economic life; agriculture, commerce, travel, education, science and religion. It calls for increased effort to obtain a broader understanding of this important subject.

Upon only one phase of calendar reform could the League Conference make a definite declaration. This was the stabilization of Easter. It was endorsed in resolutions to be submitted to religious and government authorities for consideration and approval. The World Calendar Association supports this action of the League Conference and will work wholeheartedly with churches and religious organizations in an effort to make a stabilized Easter effective as soon as possible. Of course, it is understood that Easter will still shift from year to year but its shifting is reduced to seven days, which is an improvement compared to the 35 days at present.

The report or "Survey" on calendar reform, approved by the League Conference in October, states in effect that for the first time public opinion as a whole has begun to be in a position seriously to discuss the advantages and drawbacks of the simplification of the Gregorian calendar. For the first time it has begun to be clear that it rests with public opinion alone to take whatever decision is considered advisable with regard to this reform. For the first time governments in general have been brought to regard this question as one for official discussion and deliberation.

With regard to the report there are a few points which call for clarification. It is noticeable that these points or statements are carefully qualified, an indication they do not express the convictions of a large number of delegates. These statements with their qualifications are likely to be misunderstood by some readers. To clarify and to interpret, then, is the aim of this paper.

One of these statements refers to "a mere equalization of quarters." During the League Conference this was rejected as insufficient revision.

It refers to a suggested plan of equalizing the quarters by merely transferring the last day of August to the end of February. It does not refer, at all, to the 12-month equal-quarter plan, based on the 31, 30, 30 days within the quarters, which was consistently supported by a large number of delegates.

Another statement which needs clarification is the following: "It was pointed out that the 13-months calendar was theoretically more perfect" rather than the 12-month revision. Five speakers, all of whom were in attendance as propagandists for the 13-month plan, were the only ones who expressed such an opinion. The advantages of the 12-month revision were frequently mentioned by other official delegates.

"It was suggested," the report notes, "that it would be possible to make appreciable improvements in the present calendar without introducing a perpetual calendar by adopting a non-perpetual calendar of 13-months without supplementary days." The suggestion of a non-perpetual 13-month calendar was a concession by the 13-month advocates to the opposition raised at Geneva by representatives of two religious organizations, the Hebrews and Seventh-Day Adventists. These were the only observers present from religious groups, except the representative of the Church of England, who indicated that there was no objection from his church to calendar reform. Many of the important church leaders of Europe and America had previously indicated a similarly liberal attitude to that of the Church of England.

Certain religious groups and governments have opposed reforms in the past, only to accept them later on. Thus it was with the early Julian and later Gregorian calendar reforms, and thus it was with the adoption of Standard Time by Europe and America in the early eighties.

Perhaps it is not yet sufficiently realized by the opposition group that in the perpetual calendar plan the seven-day week is loyally upheld within the year. The last day, Year Day, placed on an extra Saturday at the end of each year, safeguards the week and protects the first day Sunday, and the seventh day Sabbath, within each year. The year is a specific unit of time. The day, week and month are parts of the year and they all begin their annual round together on the same day, January 1st.

In regard to the sanctity of the Sabbath, Hebrew Scripture says: "The Sabbath is given into your hands; ye were not given over into her hands." Or in the familiar words in the Christian Gospel: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath."

Upon a vital issue of calendar reform—whether we are to have 12 or 13 months—Religion everywhere should devote its attention. The Old and the New Testament of the Bible abound with the number 12. The arrangement of the new 12-month calendar agrees with the prophetic city; and in the concluding chapter of the New Testament, one reads of

the symbolic tree of life "which bare twelve manner of fruits and yielded her fruit every month." A little further on the reader is warned against adding or taking away one word of the prophecy of this final book. Religious leaders have ever been aware of the salient qualities of the number 12—balance, divisibility, order—and because of this they have preserved to mankind the 12-month calendar. In the Koran, sacred book of the Moslems, there is this statement: "Twelve months is the number of months with God."

At Geneva the Turkish delegate raised no question of Moslem opposition to a change in the calendar on the ground of religion. Japan, follower of Buddhism and Shintoism, voiced no religious objections but definitely opposed a 13-month calendar while favoring improvement. Mahatma Gandhi, leader of the Hindus in India, expressed in a written statement his approval of reform and a 12-month plan.

Government delegates who expressed their opinions favoring a 12-month division were Switzerland, Japan, Italy, Netherlands, Greece, Germany, Irish Free State, and Danzig. The greater number of these favored the perpetual calendar. Also M. de Vasconcellos, president of the League Conference, in summarizing the discussions, declared that "as far as reform is desired, the preference appears to be for a perpetual calendar."

One of the interesting points brought up in the report is the question of auxiliary calendars. "It was suggested" that it might be possible in due course to confer upon these auxiliary calendars a legal recognition "concurrently with the use of the ordinary calendar." It is decidedly questionable whether delegates at the League Conference desired to go so far as to give these calendars "official character." The mere suggestion of legalizing auxiliary calendars would be discouraged in most countries on the ground that they would complicate and not simplify the calendar. Auxiliary calendars may be used for accounting purposes in certain industries as at present, but to invite their increase or to give them "official character" would seem unwise to most governments.

The World Calendar Association places first among its endeavors the advocacy of the League's program for a stabilized Easter. At the same time, the Association will continue its educational activities, which will aim to inform public opinion upon the disadvantages of the present calendar and the benefits to be derived from reform, for popular education in calendar revision is the immediate and pressing need. Toward these ends we will devote our efforts.

It is confidently believed the ultimate choice of the public will be for the perpetual 12-month calendar. It has much to commend it. It retains the best in tradition; it recognizes natural laws and time-divisions; it accords with the majority of religions; it upholds the balance of time, and it keeps step with the march of progress.

ACTION OF THE CONFERENCE

Resolutions adopted by the Fourth General Conference on Communications and Transit of the League of Nations.

Two separate resolutions were adopted by the Conference, the first dealing with the stabilization of Easter under the title "An act regarding the economic and social aspects of fixing movable feasts, adopted by the Fourth General Conference on Communications and Transit on October 19, 1931." This was adopted by a vote of 22 to 2, with 6 delegates voting "Yes, ad referendum" and 7 delegates abstaining from the vote. The "ad referendum" votes meant that the vote was subject to approval of the government which the delegate represented. The abstentions were mostly countries which had no interest in the subject of Easter, as for instance Japan, Siam, etc. The second resolution by the Conference dealt with the general subject of Calendar Reform and was rather indefinitely titled a "Survey." The text, heavily laden with qualifications which vitiated almost every sentence, was drafted by a "Coordination Committee" under the guidance of the permanent League official in charge of Calendar Reform.

STABILIZATION OF EASTER

WHEREAS this Conference is called upon to give its opinion on the expediency from an economic and social standpoint of stabilizing the movable feasts,

And whereas the present instability of movable feasts disturbs the regularity of industrial, financial, commercial and judicial activities, as well as the application of a normal plan of school and university studies,

And whereas the Easter season being almost universally a holiday period, the stabilization of this festival at a suitable time would offer genuine advantages to the population as a whole, and especially to employers and employees in all branches of industry, finance and commerce,

And whereas large sections of the population and particularly economic circles and those interested in education have expressed the almost unanimous desire that movable feasts should be fixed,

And whereas stabilizing the movable feasts is a preeminently religious question and any solution of the problem therefore depends on the free decision of the religious authorities,

And whereas the Conference has noted that, according to the views expressed by the Special Committee on Calendar Reform, which included representatives appointed by the Holy See, His Holiness, the Œcumenical Patriarch, and His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, consideration of calendar reform, as regards both the stabilization of Easter and the more general question of the reform of the Gregorian calendar, does not encounter difficulties which can be regarded in advance as insurmountable,

And whereas the Conference has also noted that, by a letter dated

March 7th, 1924, sent to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations through the Apostolic Nuncio in Switzerland, the Holy See announced that, if it were proved that the general welfare called for changes in the venerable traditions at present followed in determining ecclesiastical feasts, particularly the feast of Easter, the Holy See would only examine the question on the preliminary recommendation of an œcumenical council,

And whereas, in the preliminary proceedings, the other religious bodies interested have raised no objection to the fixing of movable feasts provided that such reforms meet with the approval of all the Christian churches,

And whereas it is the duty of the Conference to voice the opinion of the Governments on the secular aspects of stabilizing Easter and the movable feasts dependent thereon,

The General Conference declares:

That the Government whose representatives at the Conference have voted for this declaration, or which inform the Secretary-General of the League of Nations before May 1st, 1932, that they endorse this declaration, consider, from the economic and social standpoint, that the common good calls for the stabilization of movable feasts.

As regards the day that might be selected for the feast of Easter, most of the Governments whose representatives have expressed any opinion on the matter have pronounced in favour of the Sunday following the second Saturday in April.

The Council of the League of Nations is asked to bring this Act to the notice of the religious authorities concerned, expressing the hope at the same time that they will consider in the most favourable spirit what action they may take in the matter. The Council is also requested to notify the Governments invited to the Conference, before April 30th, 1933, of any views expressed by the religious authorities on this Act and on the action which they may propose to take upon it.

CALENDAR REFORM

The Conference decides to transmit to Governments invited to the Conference the following survey of the economic and social aspects of the simplification of the Gregorian Calendar:

The Conference has taken cognizance of the report of the Preparatory Committee on the question of the economic and social aspects of the simplification of the Gregorian Calendar and has heard the statements of the representatives of the various Governments as well as the additional information supplied by some of these with regard to the desiderata of the various National Committees. The Conference was almost unanimous in coming to the conclusion that the present is not a favorable time, taking into account the state of opinion, for proceeding with a modification of the Gregorian Calendar.

Certain delegations declared that their Governments were not in a position at the present time to form a definite opinion on questions relating to the expediency, from an economic and social point of view, of a simplification of the Gregorian calendar.

Most of the delegations to the Conference have clearly recognized that the present calendar has certain disadvantages, as explained in the report to the Preparatory Committee, and have expressed an opinion that it would certainly be desirable in principle to secure a simpler measure of time more accurately appropriate to the needs of modern economic and social life. Of thirty-five delegations, eleven were of opinion that as any reform of the calendar, however moderate, would involve a rather awkward change in century-old habits, it would be preferable not to consider any reform which would not remedy the most serious defects of the present calendar; that for instance a mere equalization of quarters would not be accompanied by advantages sufficient to counterbalance the difficulties which must necessarily be encountered in connection with any modification of traditions or any period of transition; four delegations were of a contrary opinion. It was also pointed out that such a small change from the present calendar would not confer any noticeable benefits on future generations.

A great number of delegations expressed the opinion that any reform of the calendar could only be put into practice if it came into force simultaneously throughout the world, or at least in a very great majority of States, and it was for this reason that the study of this question had been placed under the auspices of the League of Nations.

OBSERVATIONS

The Conference examined the respective merits of the perpetual calendars of twelve and thirteen months as set out in the Report of the Preparatory Committee. In the course of the discussions of the Conference it was pointed out that the thirteen-months calendar was theoretically more perfect, particularly if appropriate measures could be devised for the purpose of safeguarding existing contracts during the transitional period, but that the perpetual calendar of twelve months possessed the advantage of disturbing acquired habits to a much smaller extent.

The introduction of supplementary days bearing no weekday-name, a necessary adjunct in practice to all perpetual calendars, roused the opposition of various religious communities and certain social organizations whose representatives were heard by the Conference. Some delegations expressed the same view. Most delegations were agreed that failing a strong trend of opinion in favor of a perpetual calendar, the opposition would, at least in certain countries, make it very difficult if not impossible to introduce the perpetual calendar. It was suggested to the Conference in this connection that, if this situation continued, it would be possible to make appreciable improvements in the present calendar without introducing a perpetual calendar, by adopting a non-perpetual calendar of thirteen months without the introduction of supplementary days. That calendar would not permit, as accurately as a perpetual calendar, an exact comparison of corresponding periods in different years, but would nevertheless, in the opinion of its advocates, have the advantage of dividing up the year rationally, and allowing of an exact comparison between periods within the same

year. It would also do away with the drawback of having weeks irregularly divided between two successive months in the same year.

In the same connection, the Conference's attention was drawn in particular to the use, which is becoming more and more extensive among large commercial and industrial undertakings in certain countries, of an auxiliary calendar, usually based on the division of the year into thirteen months. It was suggested that the experience gained in this matter should be properly co-ordinated; if the use of these auxiliary calendars became sufficiently general among commercial and industrial organizations and among statistical institutions, and particularly, if they were employed by public authorities, it would gradually be possible for public opinion to perceive more clearly the consequences of a simplification of the calendar. It was also suggested that it was even possible that if this were done certain States in whose territories these calendars came into general use might think fit in due course to confer upon them an official character as auxiliary calendars recognized in certain official or private economic activities concurrently, at all events for a certain time, with the use of the ordinary calendar.

CONCLUSIONS

The Conference considered that the efforts of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit, through its Special Committee for the Reform of the Calendar, through the National Committees set up in consequence of a resolution of the League Assembly, and through the Preparatory Committee for the Conference, had not been in vain. For the first time public opinion as a whole has begun to be in a position seriously to discuss the advantages and drawbacks of the simplification of the Gregorian Calendar. For the first time it has begun to perceive clearly that it rested with it alone to take whatever decision it considered advisable with regard to this simplification. It is also for the first time that Governments in general have been brought to regard the simplification of the calendar as a definite question capable of discussion between them in the course of official deliberations. The preparatory work mentioned above, and also the discussions in the Conference, to which Governments will doubtless devote attention, will provide the competent Government departments with the material necessary for a considered decision.

In view of the situation set forth above, the Conference did not think fit to express any opinion on the principle of calendar reform but the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit will follow the efforts which will doubtless continue to be made for the purpose of enlightening opinion as to the advantages or disadvantages of a reform. It will also keep the Governments regularly informed on the matter. It will thus continue its task, which has always consisted, not in any particular propaganda, but in the impartial enlightenment of public opinion on an economic and social problem which, as experience has shown, and whatever the arguments advanced for or against the reform of the calendar, arouses a lively interest in a large number of countries throughout the world.

FROM THE MAILBAG

Our company has changed from a thirteen period year back to a monthly basis largely because of the extra time and expense involved in closing the books, etc., 13 times a year instead of 12 times. This is a disadvantage in any 13 month calendar system which I don't think has been sufficiently emphasized.—CHARLES ALMY, JR., President, Multibestos Company, Cambridge, Mass.

We operated under the 13-month calendar for four or five years, but abandoned it ten or twelve years ago. At that time we suffered the disadvantage of being very nearly unique in the experiment. We also found that for purposes of comparisons, 4-week periods were not as significant or important as quarters and halves of the year, or even 2-month stretches.—HENRY TETLOW, Henry Tetlow Company, Philadelphia, Pa.

Calendar reform is greatly needed for business of all kinds, especially for courts, legal profession, for banking and railroad business. The proposed World Calendar of twelve months is the most satisfactory of any proposed reforms I have seen.—E. E. GOOD, Judge, Nebraska Supreme Court, State Capitol, Lincoln, Neb.

The revised 12-month calendar is the best and most attractive suggestion I have yet encountered. I am for it.—W. P. CRAEMER, Merchant, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

After careful study, believe The World Calendar to be the best suggested plan we have ever seen. Certainly hope the plans advance rapidly, and that 1933 finds the U. S. A. and all others ready to use it. We are with you. We have explained it to our listeners.—KENNETH FORDYSE, Manager, Radio Station KGFL, Raton, N. M.

Calendar Reform is both necessary and desirable from an economic standpoint. The 12-month plan of The World Calendar Association is preferable from a business viewpoint to the 13-month plan.—CARL D. SMITH, Dean, School of Business, Northeastern University, Boston, Mass.

I have long believed in the need for and importance of thoroughgoing calendar revision to give us the most scientific dating tool that can be invented.—F. G. FRANKLIN, Librarian, Willamette University, Salem, Ore.

The August, 1931, Journal of Calendar Reform has entirely converted me from the position of approving a 13-month calendar reform to The World Calendar. The change of view is because The World Calendar will so slightly affect existing compilations of statistical data and general conditions.—ALFRED H. SMITH, Banker, Madison and Kedzie State Bank, Chicago, Ill.

The Journal of Calendar Reform has increased my interest in, and convinced me of, the desirability of a revision of the calendar, and like the one containing 12 months of 31 or 30 days and a Year Day the best of any I have seen. I give a course in Astronomy-Physics in which the subject of calendar revision frequently arises.—ROBERT BOREMAN, Physicist and Professor of Physics, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Autocratic authority might put over a 13-month year. This democratic generation may more easily adjust itself to the slightly modified 12-month year.—ANDREW F. HELTMAN, A.M., LL.D., Presbyterian Minister, Altoona, Pa.

I favor The World Calendar as a great improvement and better than any other suggested or proposed.—CHARLES E. KREMER, Lawyer, Chicago, Ill.

Any calendar reform must have a year evenly divisible into halves and quarters for proper accounting convenience.—B. W. TENNANT, Banker, Pittston, Pa.

I am much interested, disturbed over the present calendar and doubtful about the equities of a radical change.—DAVE H. MORRIS, Lawyer, New York City.

JOURNAL OF CALENDAR REFORM

EDITORS

CHARLES D. MORRIS CARL LIDDLE

Published by

The World Calendar Association, 485 Madison Avenue, New York City

ELISABETH ACHELIS, *President*

VOL. I DECEMBER, 1931 No. 4

WITH the close of the International Conference called by the League of Nations, Calendar Reform finds itself in a transitional period. It has graduated from swaddling clothes, but it is not yet adult. It has achieved an unquestioned international standing, but it lacks the force of a mobilized public opinion.

The man in the street is still uninformed and indifferent. What stimulus is necessary to change him?

It was pointed out at Geneva that the League of Nations cannot hope to "impose" Calendar Reform upon nations. Nor, indeed, can any government impose Calendar Reform upon its people, for this is the kind of a benefit which must be inaugurated by the public and presented to governments with the backing of popular demand. How is such a demand to be fostered and encouraged?

Obviously, the answer lies in a patient process of education, which will be effective only if it is neither dictatorial nor argumentative.

Perhaps there is some justification for the impatient remark of a League official, who at the end of a tiresome day of interminable arguments by professional calendar propagandists at the October Conference, remarked petulantly: "The main trouble with Calendar Reform is the Calendar Reformers." He was referring to their tendency to wander into technicalities and their unwillingness to remain on the solid foundation of practical possibilities.

In dealing with the public, advocates of Calendar Reform must stick to fundamentals and talk sense, without scolding. People do not like to be browbeaten. The wrong method of mobilizing public opinion is that described by Samuel Butler as the ancient type of parental education: "When Ernest was in his second year, his father began to teach him to read. He began to whip him two days after he began to teach him. All was done in love, anxiety, timidity, stupidity and impatience."

It is this handicap of anxiety, timidity, stupidity and impatience which must be avoided in calendar reform if the movement is to achieve the largest possible result from the undoubted zeal, sincerity and devotion of its leaders.

CURRENT PRESS COMMENT

Easter-tide

Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram

The advantages of a fixed Easter-tide are sufficiently obvious. The objections, if any, are religious and traditional. The League committee voted to refer the matter to the Christian churches with the recommendation that it be considered in a favorable spirit for the elimination of "the economical and social disadvantages" which now arise because of a wandering Easter date. A majority of the delegates favored fixing Easter as the Sunday after the second Saturday in April. Like election day in America, this date would wander a bit, but it would always fall into the same season of the year, whereas at times, under the present system, Easter falls as early as the fringe of winter or as late as the beginning of summer.

Sensible Progress

Pendleton (Ind.) Times

We are heartily in favor of The World Calendar, which will still leave us a year divisible into halves and quarters, will give a regular succession of months, will give fixed festivals, and give every month 26 working days.

Fixed Easter

London Times

It is, of course, common ground that Good Friday and Easter Sunday are based on the date of the Passover in the year of the Crucifixion, and also that the date of the Passover (which is regulated in the Jewish lunar calendar by a certain phase of the moon following the spring equinox) varies from year to year. But the date of any of these events in the Crucifixion year may also be stated in terms of the solar calendar. If we commemorate Easter on the Sunday nearest to the date of the first Easter in terms of the solar calendar, we shall never be "out" by more than a week, whereas with its commemoration on the present lunar system we may be "out" by as much as 34 days. The suggestion of a fixed Sunday for Easter is no new thing. It was debated at the introduction of the Gregorian calendar in the sixteenth century, but at that time respect for ancient ecclesiastical usage outweighed considerations of both practical convenience and closer approximation to the anniversary.

We're Old-Fashioned

Akron (Ohio) Times-Press

The calendar we use is little more than an inherited hodge-podge of compromises, without any sense from a mathematical or astronomical standpoint. The Romans got started all right, with five months containing 31 days and seven containing 30, though they would have done much better had they followed the moon and tacked on an extra day at New Year. Then they stole a day from February to honor Julius Cæsar by lengthening July, and another to lengthen August in honor of his nephew. We have pursued this nonsense for 2000 years.

A Definite Step

Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel

Perhaps if this had not been a time of world depression and of general concentration upon subjects of more pressing importance than calendar reform, more might have been accomplished by the conference. But the probability is that if and when a perpetual calendar is adopted it will have to be done over the opposition of the orthodox Jews and the Seventh Day Adventists. That it will be so done sooner or later is certain, for these sects cannot indefinitely prevent a reform of far-reaching benefit to all the world.

Meanwhile there is room for satisfaction in the definite step taken for the stabilization of Easter—an important piece of calendar reform—and in the vast amount of public educational work upon the question of calendar reform that has been done all over the world. The effect of this will not be lost, and if the work is continued will cumulate sooner or later in a demand for positive international action for a perpetual calendar.

MEMBERS OF THE WORLD CALENDAR ASSOCIATION

485 Madison Avenue, New York City

Membership is based on an active interest in the study of an adequate and effective improvement of the calendar. Owing to lack of space, a large number of names have been omitted. They will be printed in future issues.

Grace Abbott, Child Welfare Leader, Washington.
J. D. Adams, Attorney, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Frank Ahlforth, C. P. A., Chicago, Ill.
H. R. Alfronian, Mgr., Cedar Rapids Transfer Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Charles H. Allen, C. P. A., Oklahoma City.
Lewis H. Allen, C. P. A., Buffalo, N. Y.
W. H. Andersen, C. P. A., Chicago, Ill.
H. C. Anderson, Accountant, Washington, D. C.
Rasmus B. Anderson, Author, Madison, Wis.
Katharine Arbuthnot, Teacher, Normal School, Monmouth, Ore.
Martin J. Arft, C. P. A. and Pres., Ohio State Board of Accountancy, Toledo, Ohio.
Leonore D. Baldwin, Attorney, New York City.
Wm. J. Banows, Headmaster, De Veaux School, Niagara Falls, N. Y.
A. B. Barakat, Accountant, Upper Darby, Pa.
M. H. Barnes, C. P. A., Savannah, Ga.
Parry Barnes, C. P. A., Kansas City, Mo.
J. D. Bartlett, Postmaster, La Fayette, Ind.
George Gordon Battle, Attorney, New York City.
Howard C. Beck, C. P. A., Washington, D. C.
Wilford A. Beesley, C. P. A., Salt Lake City.
R. H. Belknap, C. P. A., Boston, Mass.
Wm. H. Bell, C. P. A., New York City.
Anthony A. Belser, C. P. A., New York City.
Harry P. Betzer, Banker, Topeka, Kan.
V. D. Bierman, Auditor, Albany, N. Y.
H. E. Bitney, Publisher, Clayton Advance, Clayton, Wis.
Andrew Blass, Business Consultant, Pittsburgh.
B. F. Blosser, Dentist, Bellflower, Cal.
Wm. L. Boatright, Attorney, Denver, Colo.
J. Lee Boothe, C. P. A., Detroit, Mich.
Stephen Borsos, Clergyman, Morgantown, W. Va.
J. O. Boyd, Attorney, Keokuk, Iowa.
Geo. R. Boyles, Pres., Madison-Kedjie Trust and Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill.
R. H. Brett, Attorney, Ardmore, Okla.
E. W. Breyer, C. P. A., Cleveland, Ohio.
W. P. Briggs, Trust Officer, Equitable Trust Co., Portland, Ore.
Robert L. Bright, C. P. A., Knoxville, Tenn.
William E. Britton, Prof. of Law, Urbana, Ill.
H. A. Bronson, Attorney, Grand Forks, N. D.
Andrew A. Bruce, Law Teacher, Chicago, Ill.
Chas. H. Buesching, Banker, Ft. Wayne, Ind.
Valery Burati, Student, Lewiston, Me.
Clare B. Burdette, Physician, Pasadena, Cal.
Leslie L. Burr, Attorney, Willits, Cal.
Frank E. Buxton, Banker, Wellesley, Mass.
H. Caffyn, C. P. A., New York City.
C. C. Caldwell, Attorney, Sioux Falls, S. D.
A. T. Cameron, Asst. Prof. in Accounting, Philadelphia, Pa.
Ernest B. Cameron, Manufacturer, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Roscoe Carle, Publisher, Fostoria, Ohio.
John M. Carson, C. P. A., Philadelphia, Pa.
M. O. Carter, C. P. A., Memphis, Tenn.
J. Curtis Casteel, Student, Columbia, Mo.
L. M. Catlin, Printer, North Loup, Neb.
Harold E. Chadburn, C. P. A., New York City.
Techariah Chafee, Student, Cambridge, Mass.
L. H. Chalmers, Attorney, Phoenix, Ariz.
J. Chandell, C. P. A., Salem, Mass.
Levi S. Chapman, Attorney, Syracuse, N. Y.
Arthur T. Chase, C. P. A., Boston, Mass.
R. E. Choate, Pres., La Plant Choate Mfg. Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Alfred B. Cipriami, C. P. A., New York City.
Geo. M. Clark, Handwriting Expert, Chattanooga.
William L. Clark, C. P. A., Tulsa, Okla.
Oliver P. Cobb, C. P. A., Memphis, Tenn.
Harry J. Cochran, C. P. A., Chicago, Ill.
Michael Cody, Pres. Union Bank and Trust Co., Montgomery, Ala.
Allen W. Collins, C. P. A., Denver, Colo.
Wm. Mills Corliss, C. P. A., Philadelphia.
L. J. Cornwell, Salesman, Wakefield, Va.
C. M. Cotterman, Merchant, Manila, P. I.
Charles S. Cowan, C. P. A., Seattle, Wash.
Theo. A. Crane, C. P. A., New York City.
L. U. Crawford, C. P. A., Kansas City, Mo.
A. D. Cree, Metaphysician, New York City.
W. M. Crook, Attorney, Beaumont, Tex.
W. H. Cullen, C. P. A., Chicago, Ill.
Geo. W. Currie, Attorney, Hattiesburg, Miss.
Joseph Cushing, C. P. A., Springfield, Mass.
Rudolph Dall, Merchant, Davenport, Iowa.
William Davenport, Prof., Louisville, Ky.
C. Kier Davis, C. P. A., Chicago, Ill.
John Wordsworth Dawson, C. P. A., New York.
Marion L. Dawson, Attorney, Brooksville, Fla.
Mary Dewees, Secretary, Mills College, Cal.
Dr. John Dewey, Educator, New York City.
George F. Diemer, Pres., East Side Bank, Niagara Falls, N. Y.
S. Dix, C. P. A., New York City.
Cleveland E. Dodge, Capitalist, New York City.
W. E. Doty, Creamery Manager, Bismarck, N. D.
C. F. Dumas, Vice-Pres., Liberty Nat. Bank, Waco, Tex.
Harry D. Duttine, C. P. A., Chicago, Ill.
Samuel Whitney Dunscomb, Attorney, Yonkers.
Hugh Dysart, C. P. A., Boston, Mass.
George A. Eberly, Judge, Lincoln, Neb.
David M. Edwards, Sec'y, Indiana Council on Int'l Relations, Indianapolis, Ind.
Arthur Ellis, Pres.-Treas., Ellis Lumber Co., Burlington, Iowa.
A. F. Emeis, Druggist, Davenport, Iowa.
Haven Emerson, Doctor, New York City.
Harold A. Eppston, C. P. A., Newark, N. J.
Roy A. Erickson, Banker, St. Paul, Minn.
J. S. Escott, C. P. A., Louisville, Ky.
A. A. Evans, Attorney, Montgomery, Ala.
Alvin E. Evans, Attorney, Lexington, Ky.
Wilmot R. Evans, Banker, Boston, Mass.
William Eyre, C. P. A., New York City.
W. M. Fanning, C. P. A., Yonkers, N. Y.
Royal B. Farnum, Art School Director, Providence, R. I.
C. J. Farris, C. P. A., Memphis, Tenn.
Robert M. Field, Attorney, New York City.
John R. Fincher, Vice-Pres., Fairmont Aluminum Co., Fairmont, W. Va.
H. B. Fink, Ass't Treas., A., T. and S. F. R.R. Co., Topeka, Kan.
Frederick Fischer, C. P. A., New York City.
Stanley G. H. Fitch, C. P. A., Boston, Mass.
F. Richmond Fletcher, Partner, Scovell Wellington and Co., Boston, Mass.
Jas. P. Francis, Acc't, New Bedford, Mass.
Earle M. French, Acc't, Boston, Mass.

Fred Fryer, Clerk, Waterloo, N. Y.
L. F. Fuld, Prof. of Economics, New York City.
J. F. Gable, Mgr., Calendar Sales, St. Paul.
Frank Gaff, Attorney, St. Louis, Mo.
Emery M. Gates, Statistician, Chicago, Ill.
A. E. Gault, Teacher, Bradley Poly. Inst., Peoria, Ill.
J. H. Gilby, C. P. A., Chicago, Ill.
L. K. Gimson, C. P. A., New York City.
Isidor Ginsberg, C. P. A., New York City.
Morris Glasser, C. P. A., Chicago, Ill.
Edwin C. Goddard, Professor of Law, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Myron M. Goldman, C. P. A., New Orleans, La.
C. H. Goodell, Sec'y, Atlas Imperial Diesel Engine Co., Oakland, Cal.
C. H. Goodrich, C. P. A., Jacksonville, Fla.
J. Pryse Goodwin, C. P. A., New York City.
A. B. Gordinier, Banker, Hoboken, N. J.
A. B. Gordon, C. P. A., Chicago, Ill.
Bernard M. Gordon, Comptroller, New York City.
F. W. Graff, Prof., Western Reserve Univ., Cleveland, Ohio.
Berl G. Graham, C. P. A., Cincinnati, Ohio.
G. A. Graham, Dentist, Lapeer, Mich.
J. M. Graham, Life Insurance Salesman, Mountain View, Cal.
William Green, Labor Leader, Washington.
Henry G. Greenfeld, C. P. A., New York City.
Elmer C. Greer, Attorney, Newport, Tenn.
R. W. Griffith, Attorney, Little Rock, Ark.
L. P. Guy, Pur. Agent, Columbia Steel Co., Provo, Utah.
John W. Haarer, Banker, Lansing, Mich.
H. M. Haesloop, Accountant, New York City.
Robert Hale, Attorney, Portland, Me.
F. A. Hamilton, C. P. A., Cincinnati, Ohio.
John S. Hampton, Executive, Memphis, Tenn.
J. W. Hanks, C. P. A., Portland, Ore.
Frank E. Hare, C. P. A., Philadelphia, Pa.
William L. Hart, Attorney, Alliance, Ohio.
Charles Hathaway, Teacher, St. Andrew's, Tenn.
John L. Harvey, C. P. A., New York City.
Elmer L. Hatter, C. P. A., Baltimore, Md.
H. C. Hawes, C. P. A., Chicago, Ill.
T. Hawlinson, Midland Mortgage Co., Davenport, Iowa.
Leslie A. Heath, C. P. A., Charlotte, N. C.
Harry T. Hedges, Realtor, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
J. D. Herron, Clergyman, Cincinnati, Ohio.
R. W. Haggins, County Judge, McAlester, Okla.
Robert W. Hill, Attorney, Salem, Mass.
Geo. C. Hitchcock, Attorney, St. Louis, Mo.
Franklin G. Hoagland, Mgr., Drake College, Jersey City, N. J.
Ray Hohl, Banker, Detroit, Mich.
H. M. Holden, Attorney, Houston, Tex.
Gunnar E. Hollstrom, Instructor, Worcester Poly. Institute, Worcester, Mass.
Ford E. Hovey, Banker, Omaha, Neb.
B. H. Holtkamp, Clergyman, Meadville, Pa.
Grace Travis Jean, Sec'y, Omaha, Neb.
J. H. Johnson, Pres., Belmont-Sheffield Trust and Savings Bank, Chicago, Ill.
S. A. Jones, Attorney, Little Rock, Ark.
K. S. Kao, Prof., Central Univ., Nanking China.
Carl S. Kennedy, C. P. A., New Orleans, La.
Charles Kerr, Attorney, Washington, D. C.
J. S. Kimmel, Head of Wholesale Concerns, Davenport, Iowa.
William M. Kingsley, Banker, New York City.
Thos. T. Kirk, Physician, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Walter M. Kirk, Monuments, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
J. G. Korner, Attorney, Chevy Chase, Md.
F. Krebs, Banker, Johnstown, Pa.
A. R. Lawton, Attorney, Savannah, Ga.
C. R. Layman, Store Mgr., Davenport, Iowa.
E. F. Lester, Chief Justice, Supreme Court, Oklahoma City, Okla.
Albert Levitt, Attorney, Redding, Conn.
Merton E. Lewis, Attorney, Rochester, N. Y.
Wm. H. Lloyd, Attorney, Philadelphia, Pa.
Harry V. Litton, Bonds and Stock, Lincoln, Neb.
Lloyd B. Loggins, Div. of Research and Statistics, Federal Reserve Bank, Dallas, Tex.
Theodore K. Long, Attorney, New Bloomfield, Pa.
Lee Francis Lybarger, Attorney, Mifflinburg, Pa.
W. W. McCrony, Attorney, San Antonio, Tex.
J. McDurant, Teacher, Hazleton, Pa.
John P. McGoorty, Judge Superior Court, Chicago.
B. H. McKeeby, Dentist, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
F. B. McKinney, Banker, Long Beach, Cal.
A. L. McKinstry, Sales Mgr., Cedar Rapids Gas Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
David McMillan, Mgr., Alexander Hamilton Institute, Melbourne, Australia.
F. W. McReynolds, Attorney, Washington.
Charles S. McVeigh, Attorney, New York City.
W. P. Mahoney, Banker, Duluth, Minn.
George A. Mark, Clergyman, Leominster, Mass.
Jay E. Markle, Banker, Duluth, Minn.
E. Lydia Martin, Attorney, Washington, D. C.
G. E. Mayer, Photographer, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Robert Mazet, Attorney, New York City.
C. W. Meek, Attorney, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
T. M. Mehaffy, Associate Justice, Supreme Court, Little Rock, Ark.
Rodney A. Mercur, Attorney, Towanda, Pa.
Jeremiah Meterer, Judge, U. S. District Court, Seattle, Wash.
Albert E. Miller, Attorney, Marquette, Mich.
Justin Miller, Dean, School of Law, Durham, N. C.
F. C. Mills, Pres., Union Square Savings Bank, New York City.
W. W. Moore, Attorney, Houston, Tex.
B. F. Morgan, Merchant, Fortune, Cal.
Gilbert H. Morris, Banker, Asheville, N. C.
William E. Mullen, Attorney, Cheyenne, Wyo.
William Starr Myers, Prof., Princeton, N. J.
Lawrence E. Neville, Journalist, St. Louis, Mo.
J. C. Nevin, Federal Reserve Bank, Pittsburgh, Pa.
K. Bruno Newmann, Clergyman, Arenzville, Ill.
J. Nirenstein, Attorney, New York City.
Mrs. William L. Nisbet, Pres., Queensboro Fed. of Mothers' Clubs, Flushing, L. I.
Edwin C. Norton, Dean, Pomona College, Claremont, Cal.
Robert Norwood, Clergyman, New York City.
Eldred Olson, Salesman, Stanton, Iowa.
C. G. Pattison, Banker, Portland, Ore.
E. M. Perkins, Banker, Ft. Worth, Tex.
C. H. Pope, Vice-Pres., The Munsey Trust Co., Washington, D. C.
O. S. Powell, Statistician, Federal Reserve Bank, Minneapolis, Minn.
R. L. Rodgers, Sec'y, Rotary Club, Erie, Pa.
Wm. S. Rowden, Clergyman, Coleridge, Neb.
J. C. Ruppenthal, Attorney, Russell, Kan.
H. N. Rust, Banker, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
H. L. Scott, Chmn., N. J. State Highway Commission, Princeton, N. J.
A. Schaller, Instructor, Dr. Martin Luther College, New Ulm, Minn.
Fletcher Seymour, Editor, Ravinia, Ill.
Ernest J. Smith, Dentist, Ipswich, Mass.
Jas. E. Sparkman, Banker, Springfield, Mo.
Philip Spira, Banker, Cleveland, Ohio.
A. L. Stiles, Banker, Wheeling, W. Va.
Walter B. Sullivan, Asst. Credit Mgr., Rochester.
E. R. Thayer, Banker, Columbia, S. C.
Adah G. Thompson, Sec'y, Am. Trust, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Irving N. Tilden, Physician, Mattapoisett, Mass.
A. Karl Tischeo, C. P. A., Philadelphia.
Richard Toddy, C. P. A., Brooklyn, N. Y.
A. W. Tressler, Banker, Madison, Wis.
August H. Tuechter, Pres., Cincinnati Bickford Tool Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Irving A. Vant, Banker, So. St. Joseph, Mo.
David R. Wahlberg, C. P. A., Chicago, Ill.
Ross Walker, Vice-Pres., First Exchange State Bank, Los Angeles, Cal.
S. Weidenfeld, Acc't, Evanston, Ill.
N. E. Weigley, Merchant, Davenport, Iowa.
W. C. Wetzel, Dentist, Shamokin, Pa.
C. W. S. Wheeler, Banker, East Cambridge, Mass.
Chas. Wilcox, Sec'y, Kirkland, Wash.
Otto G. Wismer, Banker, Detroit, Mich.
C. William Wohlers, Pres., Hamburg Savings Bank, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Paul E. Zimmermann, Pres., Oak Park Trust and Savings Bank, Oak Park, Ill.